

Willsborough Recorder.

UNION, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE LAWS—THE GUARDIANS OF OUR LIBERTY.

Vol. XVII.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1836.

No. 508.

IN THE SENATE.

DEBATE ON MR. BENTON'S RESOLU-

TIONS

Monday, January 25

Mr. SOUTHARD continued.

When the House objected to one of the amendments, from which they afterwards receded, they sent the bill back to the Senate with a new section added to it in the following words:

"And be it further enacted. That the sum of three millions of dollars be, and the same is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended, in whole or in part, under the direction of the President of the United States, for the military and naval service, including fortifications, ordnance, and increase of the navy." Off what conditions? "If the expenditure be necessary for the defence of the country." Who is to judge of the necessity? The President. Can appropriation be more indefinite—less specific? The amount short of three millions is absolutely in his discretion. The "necessity" rests on his judgment, not in the judgment of Congress. The selection of objects is in his choice. He might expend the whole in raising an army. He might increase the navy by men and ships, at his pleasure. He might devote the whole to one object, or divide it among several. It clothed him with unlimited discretion on all points save one, the amount of three millions. Such a bill is new in the practice of the Government—unknown at former periods and under former Executives. We have before passed through times of trial, and been engaged in actual war; yet such investment of power was not found expedient or necessary. It was reserved for the disciples of Mr. Jefferson, who claim to be the especial advocates of his principles—the Democrats, *par excellence*—the only men who have passed pure and untroubled through the corruptions of the times of Madison, Monroe, and Adams, to devise and support this bill. I commend to their notice the language and opinions of Mr. Jefferson.

In our care, too, of the public contributions, entrusted to our direction, it would be prudent to multiply barriers against their dissipation, by appropriating specific sums to every specific purpose susceptible of definition; by disallowing all applications of money varying from the appropriation in object, or transcending it in amount, by reducing the undefined field of contingencies, and thereby circumscribing discretionary powers over money, and by bringing back to a single department all accountabilities for money where the examinations may be prompt, efficacious, and uniform."—*Mr. Jefferson's Message, December 8, 1801.*

It might have been objected to as irregular, unusual, and unparliamentary. It was made as an amendment to the amendment of the Senate. As such, it must restrain, enlarge, or modify the matter to be amended. It did neither. It was a distinct section, an independent and incoherent subject. The House might, with equal propriety, have added a new bill, or all the bills of the session.

But it was not resisted on this ground. There were other and higher considerations, vitally affecting the institutions of the country.

It was opposed to the spirit and meaning of the Constitution, and the whole practice of the Government. The 7th item of the 9th section of the first article declares, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." The term appropriation implies that the object must be specified. Without it is, the intent of the makers of that instrument is violated. A mere declaration that the Executive may draw out a million of dollars, and apply it to such objects as he shall think necessary for the public interest, is no compliance with the constitutional provision. Its design was to guard sedulously the public treasure—to secure its control to those who make the laws—to cut off Executive discretion as to the objects on which it should be expended. The present President has said (*Message, Dec. 1834*), that "the palpable object of this provision is, to prevent the expenditure of the public money for any purpose whatsoever which shall not have been first approved by the representatives of the people and the states in Congress assembled. It vests the power of declaring for what purposes the public money shall be expended in the Legislative Department of the Government, to the exclusion of the Executive and Judicial," &c. &c. He has also said, on another occasion (*Message, Dec. 1835*), "no one can be more deeply impressed than I am with the soundness of the doctrine which restrains and limits, by specific provisions, Executive discretion, as far as it can be done consistently with the preservation of its constitutional character." That it is "the duty of the Legislature to define, by clear and positive enactments, the nature and extent of the action which belongs to the Executive to superintend," &c. "That the true rule of action 'should make the President ever anxious to avoid the exercise of any discretionary authority, which can be regulated by Congress. The biases which may operate upon him will not be so likely to extend to the various classes of the people in that bo-

ld be set by human foresight—a war, upon which, in the present state of Europe, other nations would not have looked with an indifferent neutrality, but, in all probability, convulsing the whole of Christendom. If war, and such a war, be necessary, (and it may become so, and I may yet be its advocate and supporter,) I implore that it may not be commenced by discretionary powers vested unconstitutionally in one man, but be the result of the calm and *constitutional* decision of the representatives of the people, who are to bear its trials and face its perils.

In Rome, sir, they did sometimes create a dictator, whose duty it was to look to it, *ne quid detrimenti republika copiat*; but they did it by no violation of their Constitution and the principles of their Government, but when the enemy was at the gates of the Capitol, and despair found no other remedy.

Was there any necessity, at that time, of bestowing the slightest discretionary power upon the President? In what did the necessity consist? We were not at war, unless upon our own action. France had made no movement to assail us. She had no cause of complaint which could justify her in commencing hostilities.—We owed her no debt. She insisted on no violation of treaty upon our part. There was not a man in Congress—in the nation—in the world, that believed that she would first assail us unless we did something which should induce her. This, whatever it might be, it was proper that Congress, not the Executive, should decide—And, as Congress was about to adjourn, nothing would or could constitutionally be done to occasion the commencement of hostilities. The presence that we might have war, and that France might assail us, before we met again, were utterly fallacious. The Executive might have so acted as to create speedy difficulties, but I had no desire to offer him inducements so to act. We had claims on France—she owed us money; we had a treaty which her honor and justice required her to keep. But the time and mode of enforcing the payment of that debt, and coercing the fulfilment of that treaty, was in our own power; and the Constitution required, when force was to be applied, Congress should sit in judgment and decide it. There was no exigency which could demand that we should forget the ordinary guards which our Government provides. And even if our situation had been extreme, if the danger had impended, was there not time enough for Congress, during that session, to have defined the objects of expenditure, and specified the sums? If danger should have arisen subsequent to our adjournment, had not the Executive power to call together and consult those whom the Constitution designates as the counsellors and guardians of the People's rights on such an occasion? I could not see or feel the necessity for vesting in the President a discretion in which his mode of dealing with constitutional questions had not given to me much confidence. I regarded that section as a dangerous encroachment upon the Constitution, and the more dangerous because urged on under pretences of national defence and safety. It is by such encroachments that that instrument is to be beaten down and destroyed. I could not see its safest provisions hazarded unnecessarily. There is enough, day by day, and hour by hour, even in this hall, and much more out of it, to warn us that our only safety lies in guarding it; and that in it, and it alone, lies the permanency of the Union and the hopes of freedom.

In addition to all these considerations, it was an appropriation not called for by the Executive—a voluntary bestowal of discretionary power unasked by him. It was resisted, at the moment, by the Senator from Tennessee on this ground. If the President thought it necessary, it was his high constitutional duty so to declare officially "He shall, from time to time, give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." (2 art. 3 sec.) When and where did he recommend this measure? In what communication is it to be found? Not in the message at the opening of the session; not in that of the 30th December. Was it, as the Senator from New Hampshire seems to suppose in that of 27th February? (*Journal 194.*) That message communicates the correspondence on the subject up to that date, with the information that Mr. Livingston had been instructed to quit France if an appropriation should not be made by the Chambers; and then adds, "the subject being now, in all its present aspects, before Congress, whose right it is to decide what measures are to be pursued on that event, I deem it unnecessary to make further recommendation, being confident that, on their part, every thing will be done to maintain the

rights and honor of the country which the occasion requires."

He expressly avoids further recommendations. He relies on those which he had before made. He does not ask us to place a part of the treasury at his disposal. He does not tell us that it is necessary for us to arm. He gives no indication of a wish for such an appropriation. It is true he has since told us that this section of the bill was "in conformity with the wishes of the Executive;" but when and where and to whom were those wishes made known? If communicated at all, it must have been by private confidence to favorite members. It must have been with the understanding that it should operate upon their votes, and not be publicly and officially promulgated. I do not accuse him of such a course. It would be a base shrinking from the responsibility of his high station, holding, on a great national question, in which the peace of his country was involved, a language official and unofficial; a language public, and a language confidential. I do not credit the assertion that he deals with members of Congress in this mode. And yet, sir, if he did wish that appropriation to pass in that form, and his wish was known, it must have been by secret confidential communications to members; for it is to be found in no public document, no official declaration of the Chief Magistrate.

So far as the Senate is concerned, his wish was not known. We were not only ignorant that such was his wish, but had no knowledge that the proposition would be made. The Senator from New Hampshire tells us that we were notified, and that Mr. Cambreleng had stated in the House, upon the vote respecting the French treaty, that he should move such an appropriation. I beg the Senator to reflect upon such an argument, to sustain such a proposition. A member of the House states, in his place, in debate, that he will move a particular appropriation at some future time, and this is to be regarded as sufficient official information that the Senate will be called upon to make that appropriation! And we must be prepared to pass upon it, without estimate, without document of any kind to examine and guide us. We have fallen on strange times, sir, and new notions multiply in relation to official duties and legislative obligations. But let us look at this warning given by the chairman of Foreign Relations, who is to be our oracle in these high matters. When was it made? On the 28th February. Where? In debate in the House. When was it published? I find it in the *Globe* of the 2d March, issued at a moment when it is not probable that half a dozen of even the most devoted students of that print were able to read its report of the proceedings of Congress. And yet this report, at such a time and under such circumstances, is offered as evidence that the Senate ought to have known and been prepared for this most extraordinary proposition. But it is still more unfortunate for the reason of the Senator, that the proposition of which Mr. Cambreleng gave notice, was not that which is contained in the section which we rejected. It was, in substance, that "he should move an amendment to the fortification bill when it returned from the Senate, of one million for the army, and two millions for the navy, in case it should be necessary before the next meeting of Congress. This, he understood, would be all that would be required by the Executive branch of the Government." Now it is obvious to remark on this report: 1. That the bill was not then in the Senate. It had been returned to the House, referred to, and reported on by the committee. (*Journal, 451, 464, 506.*) 2. That his notice differs widely in substance from the proposition subsequently made. 3. That he understood that the Executive would require no more. How did he understand it? He ought to have given to other members the light which he had on the subject. Is it to be understood that as chairman, or in any other than a public official capacity, he receives directions from the Executive what amount of public money he is to put at his disposal? If he do, he may as well adopt Antony's profession of faith:

"I shall remember,
When Caesar says, *do this* it is performed"

As little benefit by way of justification can be found for this appropriation in the vote of the House respecting the treaty. The message of the 7th and 30th December had been before the Committee on Foreign Relations up to the 27th February, when a report was made, accompanied by three resolutions. (*Journal, 466.*) On the 2d of March the House considered them, in conjunction with three resolutions offered by Mr. Adams, as amendments thereto. (*Journal, 496.*) The first resolution of the Committee was, "That it would be incompatible with the rights and honor of the United States further to negotiate in relation to

the treaty entered into by France on the 4th July, 1831, and that this House will insist upon its execution as ratified by both Governments." The amendment was, "That the rights of the citizens of the United States to indemnity from the Government of France, stipulated by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 4th July, 1831, ought in no event to be sacrificed, abandoned, or impaired, by any consent or acquiescence of the Government of the United States;" and was subsequently, after debate, modified by Mr. Adams, and was in these words: "Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, the treaty with France of the 4th July, 1831, should be maintained, and its execution insisted on."

After various efforts at amendment and change, it *PASSED unanimously*. (*Journal, 500.*) The other amendments offered by Mr. A. were then withdrawn by him. The second resolution of the committee was in these words: "Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of so much of the President's message as relates to commercial restrictions or to reprisals on the commerce of France," and passed unanimously; thus concurring with the unanimous vote of the Senate in regard to the recommendation of the Executive. The remaining resolution was in these words: "Resolved, that contingent preparation ought to be made to meet any emergency growing out of our relations with France;" and this resolution was, on motion of Mr. Cambreleng, ordered to lie on the table. (*Journal, 501.*) It was the 2d March; the order to lay on the table was, under the circumstances, equal to rejection or withdrawal; for there could be no hope of again calling it up, discussing and deciding it. Here, then, on the very day before this extraordinary section was introduced into the bill, while a resolution, which declared contingent preparations to be proper, was before the House, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on his own motion, disposed of it, and declined taking the sense of the House upon it. Could it have been anticipated, after that, that Congress would be called upon to place three millions of money in the hands of the Executive without specification of objects? Did the committee expect war? Did they think France would assail us? Did they believe legislation necessary? Why then was not the sense of the House taken upon the question? The Senate had long before unanimously declared that no legislative action was at this time necessary. The House had just before unanimously relieved the committee from all further consideration of the only recommendations made by the Executive; thus declaring those recommendations improper, or, at least, the measures proposed unnecessary. And now the resolution for contingent preparation is laid on the table by the assent of the friends of the Executive, Sir, I ask again, did they expect war? No, sir, they knew better. The appropriation was not called for by anticipation of an attack from France. If it was, the friends of the Executive, the House of Representatives, were greatly wanting in their duty to the country.

Look at the only resolution which they did pass. It declares "that the treaty should be maintained and its execution insisted on." And who in this country has ever held a different language? But how insisted on? By immediate war? Was that the meaning of the House? Was it a war measure? Then, more guilty legislation cannot be imagined. Go to war with peace appropriations, without one preparatory measure by Congress? The House meant no such thing. To suppose that they did, would be an impeachment of something more than their intelligence. They left the question of further negotiation entirely open by the rejection of the resolution which declared it incompatible with our rights and honor, and they adopted one which merely declared that the treaty ought to be maintained. And had France then, or has she yet, declared that she did not consider it binding on her, and that she would not maintain it? On the contrary, she has always admitted its validity, and acknowledged that the debt was due to us. She has delayed, and delayed improperly, upon insufficient reasons, to comply with her obligations under it, but the resolution of the House asserted no fact which France has controverted. I do not intend to inquire, on this occasion, into the sufficiency of the reasons urged by her. It is enough, for the present, to say that the act of the House did not render war necessary; that it was not anticipated as speedily, if at all, to arise; and that those who favored this contingent appropriation can find in this resolution no apology for it. The chairman of the committee, the person who moved this section, is reported to have said, in debate, as late as the 28th of February, "if we are to have peace, the

the better. If war, THE NEXT CONGRESS would have enough to say on that great question." The question of war, if decided at all, was, in his opinion, to be decided by another Congress. And, out of the House, all parties concurred in the hope and belief that it would be avoided. It was but four or five days previous that the official paper, which is regarded, even by our foreign ministers, as expressing opinions worthy of all confidence, contained the following editorial remarks: (Globe of 24th February.)

"From the extracts given in this day's paper from the foreign journals, and especially the remarks of the French minister on the introduction of the law to provide for the treaty, it will be seen that there is now the fairest prospect of a speedy and happy adjustment of our difficulties with France," &c.

"Mr. Livingston will not, it appears, apply for his passports, but will await the action of the Chambers in relation to the law proposed by the Ministry."

It then gives an extract of a letter of congratulation on the prospects which the late news has opened on the country, which, in conclusion, says: "The Opposition seem confounded this morning, and even the most desperate in their ranks say the President has had the good fortune to take the right course in this matter. Chance has had no hand in it, my friend; it is parcel of his great, fair, and clear course." "We believe all the difficulty in the matter to have grown out of the intrigues of some one on our own side of the Atlantic," &c.

The extract administers the usual dose of flattery which parasites are ever ready to bestow on the hand that distributes honors and profits, but it conveys the strong impression which then prevailed. And war was not expected here nor elsewhere, at least, not so expected as to justify large discretionary appropriations. To have gone to war, then, would have been most absurd; nothing could, indeed, have been more absurd than the position which we should have occupied. It was justly remarked about that time, "To go to war now, would be like two boys standing before each other with clenched fists, and each daring the other to strike. If we did go to war with France on this subject, it would all end in an expenditure of millions upon millions of treasure, and oceans of blood, and we should then be asking each other who struck the first blow."

Mr. President, that section of the bill, thus introduced, was neither necessary nor expedient, to be justified by no facts, hostile to every correct principle of legislation, and the majority of the Senate, by a vote of twenty nine to nineteen, rejected it. (Journal, page 232.) The names are recorded; and, while the minority doubtless acted upon a proper sense of their duty, the majority will not, I feel assured, have cause to condemn themselves. For myself, I concurred most heartily in the disagreement to the section, and cheerfully put myself upon the principles involved, and leave my act to the award of the future.

But, Mr. President, I ask attention while I proceed still further with the history of the bill.

It returned to the House, as is, I believe, agreed on all hands, before ten o'clock. Mr. Gholson then moved that the House recede from their amendment, and urged it strongly upon them. (Journal, 516.) It was opposed, sir, and the reported language is worthy of observation. Mr. Cambreleng, the chairman of the committee, and the person who moved the section, "hoped the House would not recede. If the Senate had chosen to take the responsibility of defeating the appropriation, it might remain with them; he would take no part of it." And Mr. Bynum sustained him. Now, this was long before twelve o'clock. It was upon the first disagreement. It was while there was a quorum, for the vote against receding was 110 to 87. Why, at this early hour, with a full attendance of members, was the declaration made that "the responsibility of defeating the appropriation" was upon the Senate? Why did the mover refuse to take no part in it? Was the appropriation necessary to the defence of the country, and was it not worth while to make an effort to save it? Was an enemy approaching our shores, and was it more desirable to cast the responsibility on the Senate, than to defend the country?

The House, on motion of Mr. Cambreleng, determined to insist upon the section, and so informed the Senate; but they asked no conference. It was their amendment; they had voted to insist; and it was proper, if they desired to avoid difficulty and secure its passage, to ask a conference respecting it. The Senate had previously done so, that very night, on an amendment of theirs to the bill making appropriation for the civil and diplomatic expenses of the Government. The conference was had, and the bill passed. (Journal, 512-515.) But the House, upon this bill, did not choose to take this course. They chose rather to put it in jeopardy. The Senate adhered to their decision, by a vote of 29 to 17 (Journal, 235,) and the bill was speedily returned. This course of the Senate was perfectly parliamentary and correct, as is known to Senators, and as I shall presently have cause to explain.

When the bill again came to the House, it had another opportunity of asking a conference and saving their amendment, the whole bill; if there could be a

compromise made. They did not seize the opportunity. Other counsels prevailed. The mover of the section now moved to *adhere* to it. This would have defeated the bill irretrievably. No subsequent movement could have saved it. Why, then, was the motion made? Was it resolved upon that the *whole bill*, with all its appropriations, should be lost, because the Senate had not consented to put three millions of dollars at the disposal of the President? There was yet time enough. It was not twelve o'clock, and there was a quorum. Yet, if this motion had prevailed, the bill would have been lost with time and quorum both. The course taken exhibited a fixed purpose that no appropriation should be made for any of the fortifications, unless this large sum was granted; and this most improper and unconstitutional demonstration of confidence was manifested towards the President. Was it deemed necessary, as an *offense* against the unanimous rejection of his advice and the refusal to give him the power of making reprisals?

Mr. Mercer moved that the House recede. This would have ended the controversy, and saved the appropriations for fortifications, amounting to \$860,000. And how, sir, was his motion met? Mr. Polk, the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, urged that the motion to *adhere* was first in order, and to be first put. And, in no very measured language towards the Senate, Mr. Zytel sustained him; thus aiding the movement of Mr. Cambreleng to *adhere*, defeat the whole bill, and try to throw the blame upon the Senate.

The Speaker (then Mr. Bell) decided that the question on receding must be first taken. It was put, and rejected by 107 to 88. (Journal, 519.)

Upon both of the motions to recede the votes are recorded. It was an almost precise division of parties. Those who are called opponents of the Administration voted so as to save the bill, but lose the contingent section. Its friends voted to save the grant of money to the Executive, at the hazard of the whole bill. In this stage of these extraordinary proceedings, Mr. Hubbard (and he deserves thanks for breaking rank) moved for a conference. (Journal, 519.) It was asked and promptly agreed to by the Senate, although they had voted to *adhere* to their rejection of the section. (Journal, 237.) If they had desired to defeat the bill, why did they waive their vote to *adhere* and agree to the conference? They might have refused it, and been perfectly justified by parliamentary rule and propriety. Even the desire to throw the responsibility on the Senate, could not have put them in the wrong. There is potent authority on this point in the journals of this body. In January, 1828, the two Houses had before them a very important measure—a judiciary bill, having the same object as that which has recently passed the Senate. The bill from the House was considered, debated on several days, amended, and sent back. The House voted not to accept a part of the amendments, and returned it to the Senate. The Senate, on the motion of Mr. Van Buren, then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, *adhered* to their amendments. The House asked a conference. The message asking the conference was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and the same chairman made a report refusing the conference. That report is worthy of the respectful consideration of all those who now condemn the Senate. It sustains the positions which I have advanced in defence of the course of the Senate on this occasion. It justifies the vote to adhere, without the vote to insist. It places the duty of calling for the conference on the house which first insists. It refuses a conference after the House had asked it, because it was not the intention of the Senate to recede, and a conference was therefore unnecessary. The Senate sustained the report, by 24 to 13; and among the majority are found the names of Messrs. Van Buren, Benton, Berrien, Branch, Dickerson, Eaton, Hayne, Rowan, Tazewell, White, Woodbury. The bill was lost by this decision. The report and vote may be found in vol. 16 of Senate Journal, pages 306—312.

If this be correct parliamentary doctrine, and our opponents will not deny it, and if the Senate had desired to defeat this bill, why did we not refuse the conference? We did not. We were resolved to resist the three millions, but we sought, earnestly, the passage of the bill, and waived every rule of practice, in such cases, to accomplish it. Yet we are now charged with the defeat of the bill. The conferees on the part of the House, were Messrs. Cambreleng, Hubbard, and Lewis; on the part of the Senate, Messrs. Webster, Frelinghuysen, and Wright. They agreed—the conferees of the Senate unanimously, and the majority of those of the House. It was, at the time, understood that they also were unanimous.

It seems to have been since denied that Mr. Cambreleng did agree to the report; and the Senator from New Hampshire will not say that he did. It is quite possible that he did not. He had desired to adhere to the amendment, which would have destroyed the bill. He had manifested his anxiety to throw the blame on the Senate—and he may have feared the defeat of his object, if the conferees agreed upon a reasonable report to the two Houses. He had made a provision which repudiated all confidence and power

in the President, and he may have been unwilling that the offering should be withdrawn. But it is of little importance. The conferees did agree, and those of the Senate reported. (Jour. 237.) In lieu of the section for three millions, they proposed.

"As an additional appropriation for arming the fortifications of the United States, three hundred thousand dollars."

"As an additional appropriation for the repair and equipment of the ships of war of the United States, five hundred thousand dollars."

When this report was made, the Senate were prepared to approve it. The committee of which the Senator from New York was one, had agreed to it, and it would have passed unanimously. Sir, the whole Senate was ready to pass it. There was no fault in that respect on either side of this body. The censure must rest elsewhere.

The Senator from New Hampshire seems to find no difference between this proposition and the section, except in the amount. Has he looked at them? The one is without specification, leaving the whole expenditure, as to objects, to the Executive.

The other defines the objects for which the money is appropriated. It complies with our legislative duty. It is constitutional and proper. Mr. President, ought not this report to have been satisfactory and to have passed? It provided for the very objects which were most important in case of difficulty—our fortifications and navy: for the only objects that could have required attention before it would have been the duty of the Executive to assemble Congress, and it provided most amply for them. Observe the amounts. There had been appropriated for arming the fortifications, in the army bill, 100,000 dollars; in this bill, by a previous amendment of the Senate, 100,000 dollars more; and by this conference 300,000 dollars. In all, 500,000 dollars, for arming them in one year. Was it not ample? Could more have been used faithfully and economically? Not a dollar.

So as to the Navy. The bill for its support contained appropriations to the amount of more than 3,680,000 dollars, in which were 974,000 dollars, for repairs of vessels in ordinary, and the repairs and wear and tear of vessels in commission. Add to this sum the half million proposed by the conferees, and we have 1,474,000 dollars for the repairs and equipment of vessels of war. Was it not ample for that object, until Congress would meet, or be called together? I am compelled to believe that it was not the amount which was insufficient. It was the restriction imposed. It was a specific appropriation. It was not left to the discretion of the Executive, and his friends would not have it. They preferred losing the whole bill, to denying this expression of confidence in the Chief. Then, sir, let them answer for the loss; but let not them and the President unjustifiably charge the Senate with a failure of duty. The Senate did its duty and its whole duty to the country, faithfully. Examine this bill as it stood after the conference. It came to us with 430,000 dollars, all that the President and departments asked. We added 421,000 dollars, by the conference we agreed to add 800,000 dollars—making in all 1,660,000 dollars, almost four times the estimates of the Executive, as much as could with propriety be devoted to the object. It came with a *small specific appropriation*—was increased in the House by seven times the amount to be used at *Executive discretion*. The moment that three times the amount is agreed to by the Senate, but the Executive discretion denied, it is refused, rejected, and the Senate assailed.

I proceed. Why was this agreement of the conferees not received by the House, and the bill passed? The chairman of the managers did not report the agreement. The House did not agree to it. They had the papers, and the Senate were thus compelled to see the destruction of the bill, without the power to avoid it. They kept the papers, and we could take no vote upon it. But we did not rest in silence under this extraordinary, may I not say, without offence, this most unjustifiable procedure. If we had done nothing more, we should have been faultless in the matter. But after waiting until general alarm was felt lest it was the intention of the House to destroy the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Webster) moved that we should send a message reminding the House of the subject. (Jour. 239.) It was new in practice. Such a message, so far as I can learn, had never before been sent by one House to the other, since the establishment of the Government. But the parliamentary practice was consulted. I recollect it well, for I examined it with that Senator. In Jefferson's Manual, our guide on subjects of this kind, it is stated to be a proper message. (page 191.)—When a bill is sent by one House to the other and is neglected, they may send a message to remind them of it." 3 Hals. 26; 5 Gray, 154.

The message was sent. The entry is in these words: "Resolved, That a message be sent to the honorable the House of Representatives, respectfully to remind the House of the report of the committee of conference appointed on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill respecting the fortifications of the United States. Thus, sir, the Senate, now charged with

neglect of duty, with defeating the bill, with unwillingness to defend the country, departed from ordinary practice; adopted a new, but parliamentary proceeding, to urge the House to attend to the passage of the bill. And thus, sir, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Webster), who is so roundly and incisively accused by the Senators from New Hampshire and Georgia put in requisition his best exertions not only to do his own duty, but to press others to the discharge of theirs. The facts cannot have been well remembered by the Senators. The accusation has not been well considered. I am glad to perceive that that Senator is not, at this moment, in his seat; for it permits me to say, without indecency towards him, that in the debate upon the question, and in the whole course of our action upon the bill, as upon every other where the Constitution and the interests of his county are involved, he brought into exercise the best powers of his well disciplined intelligence and pure patriotism.

[TO BE CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT.]

his friends dare not permit his speech to be published, in the language in which it was delivered." Possibly Mr. Waddell might forego the privilege of a freeman, forbear to express his opinions of men and things, and sing huzzahs to the rising star, for a snug office by which (like the editor of the Standard) he could realize fifteen thousand dollars in the short space of three years; we say this may be possible, for we are told from high authority that "every man has his price;" but we are very sure he will not relinquish even one of the important privileges of which freemen boast, for the small emoluments attached to a seat in the Legislature. But to this point he speaks himself. Avowing a determination to pursue an independent course, and conscientiously to discharge his duty to his constituents, Mr. Waddell in his circular says: "with these opinions, defeat itself hath not many terrors; without them, success would be disgrace." The editor of the Standard may esteem these things lightly; but we can assure him that the Republicans of Orange county have not yet forgot the value which their fathers attached to independent minds and honest hearts.

We have already extended this article beyond its intended limits; but our haste to close it shall not cause us to pass entirely without notice another sweeping clause in the Standard, in which he gives a stab "under the fifth rib" which he thinks will be fatal to the political standing of Mr. Waddell. Our readers will put in possession of Mr. Waddell's circular last fall, and will recollect that for reasons stated he declined entering into a discussion of the politics of the general government; he considered these as matters which should be kept entirely distinct from state legislation. "What was right he would support; what was wrong he would oppose," independent of party considerations. This pledge as a member of the Legislature, we lately took occasion to say we thought he had faithfully redeemed. But the Standard says—

"We know of no one who has, during the last session of the Legislature, voted more *heavily* against General Jackson and his administration, than Mr. Waddell himself." This is a broad assertion; can the Standard sustain it by the exhibition of any testimony? or does it rest upon the same sort of evidence as does his assertion that the editors of the Register have been "instructed" to suppress the speech? Give us the truth, Mr. Standard, if you can. As one of "the Republicans of Orange county" we call upon you for the evidence. What did he do or say in the Legislature that exhibited so much hostility to the President? The Republicans of Orange county "have a right to know" whether Mr. Waddell has forfeited his pledge; they will punish if he has played false, as they will reward if he has been faithful. As a member of the Legislature, Mr. Waddell's constituents require that his talents shall be directed to the promotion of their interests, not for the service of a party; as a citizen, the Republicans of Orange county do not wish to deprive him of a privilege they are determined to preserve for themselves—freely to express their opinions of public men and public measures.

From much that we have seen in the Standard, we are inclined to believe that its editor is in the habit of manufacturing his facts to suit his purposes. It is certainly a very convenient practice for a person who has a bad cause to support. It enables him at any time to dress up a man of straw, and pelt it with stones and brick-bats to his heart's content; but a very small portion of common sense will soon detect the artifice, and in a little while the editor who resorts to it will become as contemptible as the men of straw which he had manufactured.

ORANGE COUNTY MEETING.

Pursuant to public notice, a respectable number of the citizens of Orange county assembled at the court house in Hillsborough, on Wednesday the 24th inst. for the purpose of adopting suitable measures for promoting the success of the White ticket, and for nominating a candidate for Governor. On motion, Callet Campbell, esq. was appointed president of the meeting; William Holt and Harrison Parker, esqrs. vice presidents; and Dennis Heartt and Dr. Edmund Strudwick, secretaries.

The meeting being thus organized, Mr. Nash rose, and in a brief manner explained the object of the meeting, and concluded by moving that a committee of five be appointed to prepare resolutions. The motion was adopted, and Frederick Nash, James Mebane, William A. Graham and Hugh Waddell, esqrs. and Dr. James S. Smith were appointed.

After a brief space, Mr. Graham, on behalf of the committee, made the following

REPORT.

As the period approaches which is to close the official term of our present Chief Magistrate, the solicitude of the people of all America is justly excited in the choice of his successor. In the exercise of no political privilege does it become a free citizen to deliberate more anxiously, to scrutinize more closely, or to search more extensively for information, than in determining on whom his vote shall be bestowed for the Presidency of the United States. In our quarter of the union public attention has been mainly concentrated on two distinguished



From the London Christian Observer.
THE MORAL OF FLOWERS.

THE WILD WALL-FLOWER.

What various turns of chance and fate
This moulder pile has known;
What wide magnificence and state
Within its halls were shown,
When crowds of knights and ladies gay
In woods of peace kept holiday!
These walls, where now with softening grace
The ivy-wreath is flung,
With trophies once of war and chase
Were thick and proudly hung;
But helmet, spear, and horn, are gone
To augment the dust we tread upon.
Full oft this cell in weary thrall
Hath lonely captive held;
And these proud towers the whizzing ball
Like granite rock repel'd:
But, sh! they fall and crumble now,
Beneath a stronger, mightier foo.
Time, Time, his withering hand hath laid
On battlement and tower,
And where rich banners were display'd
Now only waves the flower.
List, and 'twill fitting comment read
On revel gay and martial deed.

Mute is the warden's challenge, mute
The warrior's hasty tread;
And tuneless is the lady's lute,
For she is with the dead;
And but a flower now mourns the doom
Of prostrate strength and faded bloom.
Read, stranger, in this ruin's fate,
An emblem true of life;
Conflicting passions—love and hate,
Joy sorrow, fear, and strife—
Combine, alast in one dark plan
To storm the citadel of man.
And should they fail, a foe is near
Who never defeat hath known,
Time ever follows in the rear;
He wills the work is done;
For where's the beauty, strength, or pride,
Hath e'er his withering touch defied?
Wear st thou to lay the wreath of tame?
Oh bind it, heed it not;
A few brief years, thy place and name
May be alike forgot,
And but a lowly flower wave
Upon thy unremember'd grave.
Here ends the semblance. Never more
This ruin'd pile shall rise,
But man a seraph blast shall roar,
When what is mortal dies,
If while earth's changing path he trod,
His heart and hopes were fix'd on God.

DEFERRED ARTICLES.

Raleigh and Gaston Rail Road.—This company was organized on Thursday the 4th inst. by the appointment of George W. Mordecai, esq. of Raleigh, as President, with a salary of \$2500; and Messrs. Wm. Boylan, Thomas P. Devereux, and Charles Manly, of Raleigh, and Wm. Plummer and Joseph W. Hawkins, of Warren, as directors.

It was ascertained that the whole amount of stock subscribed was 5,500 shares, or \$550,000.

It was resolved, at the meeting of stockholders, "That the president and directors be requested to urge the prosecution of the work to as speedy a completion as is practicable, with due regard to its execution in a durable and proper manner."

"It will thus be seen," (says the Raleigh Register) "that this great work has been begun under the most auspicious circumstances; and the public have, in the character of the gentlemen to whom its prosecution is entrusted, the most ample guarantee that every thing will be done as it should be done."

CHATHAM COUNTY MEETNG.

A respectable and numerously attended meeting of the citizens of Chatham county was held at the court house in Pittsborough on Tuesday the 9th inst. William Albright, esq. was appointed president, William Snipes and J. Carter, esqrs. vice presidents, and Col. J. A. Bynum and Richard Fawcett, secretaries.

On motion John S. Guthrie, Robert Fawcett, Isaac Clegg, Dr. E. B. Stedman and A. H. Dismukes were appointed as a committee to draw up resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting. The committee reported the following resolutions, which were adopted with only two dissenting voices:

Resolved, That we approve of the nomination in different parts of the state already made of General EDWARD B. DUDLEY, of Wilmington, as the Candidate of the People for Governor of the state at the ensuing election in August next.

1. Because we recognise in him, a gentleman of enlarged and liberal views, of plain republican manners and principles of consistent and uniform zeal in promoting the improvement and advancement of the state—distinguished alike for his public spirit, his social qualities and active benevolence.

2. Because he is the consistent Opponent of the *Caucus System*, and all such frauds on the freedom of suffrage. Standing as he did in the foremost ranks of the

supporters of Gen. Jackson during his first election, against the Candidate of the Caucus party, we find him now standing by his principles and alike opposed to the nominee of the *Baltimore Hunging*.

3. Because he has given the strongest proof of devotion to his country, having during the last war, when a young man and enjoying abundantly the means of luxurious ease and indolence, volunteered in her service and performed an arduous tour in defence of a part of our coast from the hostile and predatory incursions of the enemy.

Resolved, That we approve of the nomination of the Hon. HUGH L. WHITE, of Tennessee, a native of North-Carolina, for the office of President, and the Hon. JOHN TYLER, of Virginia, as Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That we will give our cordial and zealous support to the individuals thus nominated, and use our best exertions to promote the success of our cause.

The President on motion, appointed the following persons, viz: William Underwood, Allen Goodwin and John S. Guthrie, as Delegates to meet such other Delegates as may be appointed by the other counties of this Electoral District, at Ashborough, during the next Superior Court of Randolph, to agree upon a suitable person as Elector for this District on the *WHITE & TYLER TICKET*.

Committees of Vigilance were appointed, consisting of six persons, for each captain's district in the county.

A Harrison Convention for the state of New York was held at Albany on the 4th inst. The Convention was numerous and respectable. Resolutions were unanimously passed nominating William H. Harrison of Ohio for the Presidency, and Francis Granger of New York for the Vice Presidency.

A resolution was also adopted, declaring that Martin Van Buren, by intriguing with the executive to obtain his influence to elect him to the presidency, has set an example dangerous to our freedom and corrupting to our free institutions."

A convention for nominating candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor is to be held at Utica on the second Wednesday in June next.

The Senate of Illinois have nominated Judge White for the Presidency, and it is confidently stated that he will obtain the vote of that State.

A bill has been passed by the Legislature of New York, authorizing each of the banks in the city of New York to borrow for two years a sum equal to one half of its capital, and to discount thereon to an amount equal to one and a half the sum borrowed.

At Franconia, New Hampshire, on the 2d instant, the quicksilver in the thermometer sunk to the bulb, 40° below zero. It is supposed a spirit thermometer would have indicated 50°. A degree of cold greater than has been experienced in any other place in the United States

The Banking Capital of Alabama amounts to \$12,000,000. The increase of 1836, was \$8,150,000.

A proposition has been made in the Legislature of Massachusetts, for chartering a bank with a capital of ten millions of dollars. A great London banker has just established an agency in Boston, under the charge of Francis J. Oliver.

Alexandria Gaz.

The Ocean Insurance Company at Boston, have declared a dividend of *forty per cent* for the last six months.

It is estimated by well informed persons that no less than 19,000,000,000 of silk worms die annually victims to the production of the amount of silk consumed in England in one year. These worms, according to the ratio of 3,000 to the pound of silk, which, by the by, is a safe one, make 6,333,333 pounds of silk, which, at \$4 per lb, would be \$25,333,442; and as England can never be a silk growing country, owing to the physical defects of her climate, the silk culturists of our country have a fine opportunity of soon becoming competitors to supply the raw material. *American Farmer.*

Valuable Recipe.—Mr. A. Brunson of Meadville, Pa. says, from fifteen years' experience, finds that an Indian meal poultice, covered over with young hyson tea, softened with hot water, and laid over burns and frozen flesh, as hot as it can be borne, will relieve the pain in five minutes; that if blisters have not arisen before, they will not after it is put on, and that one poultice is generally sufficient to effect a cure.

Beware of the beginning of evil. Here is your chief danger. It lies in venturing upon little indulgences and sins; upon slight violations of conscience and duty. These are the germs of bad habits and ruined characters. If once allowed to take root within you, to spring up and bud, they will assuredly shed over your future years the bitter fruits of sorrow and shame.

Hawes.
While you aim to fulfil the duties which you owe to society, you take the most effectual measures to promote your own respectability and happiness.

We are all in the pursuit of happiness;

we all desire the esteem and respect of our fellow men. If we would attain it we must be virtuous and useful. These will secure to us present peace and everlasting happiness.

We should do nothing when the prospects of life are fair, that we would not do when they are doubtful.

BOOK BINDING

JOHN DE CARTERET, of RALEIGH, begs leave to announce to the citizens of Hillsborough and its vicinity, and the adjoining counties, that he carries on the above business in all its various branches. He will be in Hillsborough until the 10th inst. and any orders for BINDING or BLANK BOOKS will be thankfully received.

During his stay in this place he can be found either at the Superior Court Clerk's Office, or at Mr. Palmer's Hotel.

J. B. Old Books rebound, plain or ornamented.

JOHN H. DE CARTERET.

The subscribers have seen the work of Mr. De Carteret, Book Binder, and can say that he is an excellent workman, and can recommend him to the public for industry &c.

J. TAYLOR,
JAMES WEBB.

February 18. 07-4w

NOTICE.

AT the last term of Orange County Court, the subscriber was appointed administrator of the estate of WILLIAM MC CAULEY, deceased. Notice is therefore hereby given to all persons indebted to said estate to make immediate payment; and those having claims will present them properly authenticated within the time prescribed by law, or with this notice will be plead in bar of their recovery.

CHARLES W. JOHNSTON, Admr.

December 3. 98-6w

TO CONTRACTORS.

WILL be let to the lowest bidder, at Roxborough, Person county, N. C. on the 22d day of March next, (it being the second day of March Court,) the building of a FIRE PROOF HOUSE, intended as Offices for the Clerks of the Superior and County Courts. The plan of the building will be submitted on that day.

PORTIUS MOORE,
ISHAM EDWARDS,
JOHN BARNETT,
REUBEN WALTON,
AUGUSTIN VANHOOK

Commissioners.

December 23d, 1835. 03-5w

Dr. Norwood has removed his shop to the house formerly occupied by Mr. William Huntington as a dwelling house, two doors west of Mr. Stephen Moore's Store, where he may be found when not professionally engaged.

January 5. 02-

LOST OR STOLEN

ON Thursday the 14th instant, a sum of money, consisting of one twenty dollar note, of the Bank of the United States, two ten dollar notes, one of five dollars, six of three dollars, and one of one dollar, of North Carolina bank, all of which were rolled up together in a piece of brown paper. Ten dollars will be given for any information which will lead to the recovery of the said money.

MOSHIER BARTON.

January 23d. 04-3w

Flour, Middlings & Bran,

FOR SALE by the barrel or load.

J. J. FREELAND & Co.

January 18. 03-4w

Blacksmith Business.

The subscriber respectfully informs his friends and the public generally, that he has established himself in Hillsborough, at the shop lately occupied by Mr. John Rice, where he is prepared to do all kinds of Blacksmithing, and particularly Horse-shoeing which he thinks he can perform in a superior manner.

JOHN HORNER.

He will give four dollars per hundred in cash, or four and a half in week, or one or two thousand bushels of Coal.

January 14. 03-3w

Mount Pleasant Academy.

This institution, situated two miles north of Hillsborough, will be opened for the reception of students on the 15th of January, 1836. This situation has been selected by the subscriber chiefly on account of the many advantages it possesses, in healthiness, and the correct morals of the surrounding country. Neither pains nor expense will be spared to render the academic course full and complete. Amongst other things, will be taught the following branches particularly:

1st Class—English Grammar, Penmanship, Geography, with the use of the Maps and Globes, History, Philosophy, Astronomy, Chemistry, Rhetoric, &c.

2nd Class—Latin, Greek and French Languages.

The prices of tuition will be five dollars per session for the first class, and ten dollars per session for the second class. A session will consist of five months. At the expiration of the first session there will be a public examination and a vacation of two weeks. The subscriber will render every possible attention to the morals and habits of the students placed under his care.

Board can be had convenient to the academy at five dollars per month, and in good families. The subscriber is prepared to accommodate twelve or fifteen students with board at five dollars per month.

DANIEL W. KERR.

N. B. Students prepared in the above Academy for any of our Universities.

Orange county, N. C. Nov. 26. 97-

TANNERS SEE!

1000 lbs. best Northern TALLOW for sale at the store of

WALKER ANDERSON & Co.

Hillsborough, May 23. 78-

STRAY.

TAKEN up on the 20th of Jan. 1836, and entered on the stray book of Orange county, by Jesse P. Parker, living near Red Mountain, on Flat River, a bay HORSE with black mane and tail, nine years old next spring, appraised to be worth forty dollars.

JOHN A. FAUCETT, Ranger.

January 17. 94-

FORTUNE'S HOME.

6,000 Dollars for 4 Dollars!

THE THIRD CLASS OF THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE LOTTERY,

FOR 1836.

WILL certainly be drawn on Saturday, the 19th March at Hillsborough. Those who are disposed to buy Tickets, had better be in haste to deposit their Cash at "FORTUNE'S HOME," as the tickets are going off very rapidly.

PRINCIPAL PRIZES:

1 Prize of 6,000 Dollars.

1 Prize of 3,000 Dollars.

1 Prize of 2,000 Dollars.

10 Prizes of 1,000 Dollars.

BESIDES MANY OF

500 Dollars—300 Dollars—200 Dollars—100 Dollars—

50 Dollars—&c &c &c.

Amounting in all to

One hundred and eighty thousand Dollars!

TICKETS ONLY 4 DOLLARS, HALVES 2 DOLLARS, QUARTERS 1 DOLLAR.

Risk on a Package of Whole Tickets only 23 Dollars; Packages of Halves and Quarters, in proportion.

Tickets to be had in the greatest variety of numbers, at the Office of

A. PARKS,
HILLSBOROUGH, N. C.

A number of the large Prizes have been sold lately in packages. A gentleman in Franklin county, by taking a few packages, drew one Prize of \$500, one of \$300, and small Prizes to over \$200.

February 18.

07-

Private Boarding school
FOR YOUNG LADIES.

AT KELVIN, NEAR PITTSBOROUGH.

THIS institution, long known as Mrs. EDWARD JONES'S SCHOOL, will hereafter be conducted under the joint superintendence and instruction of Miss CHARLOTTE C. JONES, and the subscriber. The next session will commence on the first Monday in February next, and continue until the middle of July, including a short vacation, when the second session of the year 1836, will commence, which will terminate on the 12th December. A competent Assistant will be employed, if necessary. It is contemplated to enlarge the accommodations for the School, and before the beginning of the next session, it is expected that every schoolroom convenience for each Young Lady will have been provided.

As